

Bogomolnyi-type bounds in unconventional superconductors without external magnetic fields

Ana Achúcarro*

Departamento de Física Teórica, Universidad del País Vasco, Lejona, Vizcaya, Spain

Department of Mathematics, Tufts University, Medford, MA (U.S.A.)

Department of Theoretical Physics, University of Groningen, The Netherlands

Juan Luis Mañes**

Departamento de Física de la Materia Condensada

Universidad del País Vasco, Apartado 644, 48080 Bilbao, Spain

(December 1995)

Abstract

Following Bogomolnyi's classical treatment of vortices, we develop a method for finding rigorous lower bounds to the Landau-Ginzburg free energy describing unconventional superconductors in the absence of external magnetic fields. This allows a more precise description of the magnetic instabilities previously considered in these systems. In particular, we derive new sufficient conditions for the stability of both the homogeneous and inhomogeneous equilibrium states.

Keywords: A. superconductors, D. phase transitions

In recent years, a number of authors have considered the possibility of magnetic instabilities in unconventional superconductors. Within the framework of a phenomenological Landau-Ginzburg description of these materials [1], a multicomponent order parameter can give rise to a number of couplings which make the system potentially unstable against spatial modulations. The stability of homogeneous phases was first considered by Zhitomirskii [2]. Soon after that, Palumbo, Muzikar and Sauls [3] described a magnetic instability in the absence of externally applied magnetic fields, associated with the creation of supercurrents due to spatial distortions of the order parameter. They found the instability by studying the change in the free energy under small perturbations about the homogeneous phase.

Using similar techniques, Zhitomirskii [4] later identified several possible inhomogeneous phases; he also derived some necessary conditions for the Landau-Ginzburg free energy functional to be bounded from below. This is a crucial question because the existence of an unstable mode, while automatically implying the instability of the homogeneous phase, does not guarantee the existence of an inhomogeneous phase. It could very well happen that the free energy is unbounded from below.

On the other hand, it is important to realize that sufficient conditions for the *instability* of a given phase are not the same as sufficient conditions for its *stability*. The standard analysis of small perturbations can only provide information about the former. The latter can sometimes be derived from a study of the minima of the potential provided the gradient terms are positive definite. Both methods tend to give conservative bounds, which often leave a region of phase space intractable. Our aim here is to bridge the gap between the two and obtain information on the stability in these intermediate regions.

In this paper we present a general method which can be used to obtain new *sufficient* stability conditions for Landau-Ginzburg free energies describing unconventional superconductors. The basic idea, inspired by Bogomolnyi's classical treatment of vortices [6], is to rewrite the free energy in such a way that lower bounds to its value are apparent. This is achieved by using the boundary conditions to transform and recombine different terms into perfect squares, so that positivity becomes obvious. As we shall see, our results are comple-

mentary to previous studies based on the analysis of small perturbations to the homogeneous equilibrium states, which yield necessary stability conditions. In some cases we are able to establish both necessary *and* sufficient conditions, thus providing the exact location of the phase transition.

Following [3] and [4] we consider an order parameter $V = (V_1, V_2)$ transforming according to the two-dimensional E_{1g} representation of the point group D_{6h} , but our method easily generalizes to other cases. We will consider z-independent configurations, with $B = \partial_x A_y - \partial_y A_x$ and $\vec{D} = \vec{\nabla} - i\vec{A}$. The free energy density can be written as

$$F = F_B + F_G + F_P \quad (1)$$

where $F_B = \frac{1}{2}B^2$ is the magnetic energy contribution (in the absence of externally applied field), F_G depends on the gradients,

$$F_G = \kappa_1 \bar{D}_\alpha \bar{V}_\beta D_\alpha V_\beta + \kappa_2 \bar{D}_\alpha \bar{V}_\alpha D_\beta V_\beta + \kappa_3 \bar{D}_\alpha \bar{V}_\beta D_\beta V_\alpha \quad (2)$$

and F_P is the potential

$$F_P = \frac{1}{2}\beta(\bar{V}V - 1)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\sigma(i\bar{V} \times V)^2 \quad (3)$$

with $\bar{V}V = \bar{V}_1 V_1 + \bar{V}_2 V_2$, and $i(\bar{V} \times V) = i(\bar{V}_1 V_2 - \bar{V}_2 V_1)$. Note that we have already performed several rescalings in order to bring the free energy into this particularly simple form. We must take $\beta > 0$ and $\sigma > -\beta$ for global stability (these are *necessary* conditions).

Let us first consider the homogeneous phases. Setting $DV = B = 0$ we have to distinguish two cases, depending on the value of σ :

- For $\sigma > 0$, F_P is the sum of two positive squares and takes its minimum value $F_P = 0$ for V real ($i\bar{V} \times V = 0$) with $\bar{V}V = 1$, i.e.,

$$V_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta \\ \sin \theta \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma > 0 \quad (4)$$

This is sometimes referred to as the *time reversal symmetric* phase in the literature.

- For $-\beta < \sigma < 0$, (3) can be rewritten as

$$F_P = \frac{1}{2}(\beta + \sigma) \left(\bar{V}V - \frac{\beta}{\beta + \sigma} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{2}\sigma \left((\bar{V}V)^2 - (i\bar{V} \times V)^2 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\sigma\beta}{\beta + \sigma} \quad (5)$$

and we have $F_P \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\sigma\beta}{\beta + \sigma}$. F_P attains its minimum value for $|\bar{V}V| = |i\bar{V} \times V| = \frac{\beta}{\beta + \sigma}$, i.e.,

$$V_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{\beta}{\sigma + \beta} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{i\theta} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \pm i \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma < 0 \quad (6)$$

also known as the *time reversal symmetry breaking* state. Eqns. (4) and (6) with $\vec{A} = 0$ represent two types of homogeneous phases. In order to study their stability, we must take into account the behaviour of F_G . Consider first configurations with $\vec{A} = 0$. The contribution to F_G from a plane wave with $V_2 = 0$ and $\vec{k} = (k_x, k_y)$ will be proportional to

$$(\kappa_{123}k_x^2 + \kappa_1k_y^2)|V_1|^2 \quad (7)$$

and this will be positive for $\kappa_{123} \equiv \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + \kappa_3 > 0$ and $\kappa_1 > 0$. These *necessary* conditions for global stability of F have been considered in [3] and [4], and in what follows they will be assumed to hold.

Consider now general configurations with $\vec{A} \neq 0$. F_G can be written

$$F_G = \kappa_{123}(|D_1V_1|^2 + |D_2V_2|^2) + \kappa_2(\bar{D}_1\bar{V}_1D_2V_2 + D_1V_1\bar{D}_2\bar{V}_2) \quad (8a)$$

$$+ \kappa_1(|D_1V_2|^2 + |D_2V_1|^2) + \kappa_3(\bar{D}_1\bar{V}_2D_2V_1 + D_1V_2\bar{D}_2\bar{V}_1) \quad (8b)$$

and it is clear that (8a) and (8b) will be positive definite forms in $\{D_1V_1, D_2V_2\}$ and $\{D_1V_2, D_2V_1\}$ respectively if

$$|\kappa_2| < \kappa_{123} \quad \text{and} \quad |\kappa_3| < \kappa_1 \quad (9)$$

If (9) is satisfied we have $F_G \geq 0$. Since the minimum value of F_P is obtained for homogeneous configurations (with $\vec{A} = 0$), it is clear that (9) represents *sufficient* conditions for the stability of the homogeneous phases. These conditions were given without proof in [2].

We will now show that the domain of existence of the homogeneous phase is in fact larger than conditions (9) suggest. Consider the case $\sigma > 0$. There are two key observations which

allow us to enlarge the region of stability given by (9). The first one is that, up to integration by parts (which is allowed, for instance, by periodic boundary conditions)

$$(\bar{D}_1 \bar{V}_1 D_2 V_2 + D_1 V_1 \bar{D}_2 \bar{V}_2) - (\bar{D}_1 \bar{V}_2 D_2 V_1 + D_1 V_2 \bar{D}_2 \bar{V}_1) = i(\bar{V} \times V) \cdot B$$

and we may write

$$F_G(\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3) = F_G(\kappa_1, \kappa_2 - \delta\kappa, \kappa_3 + \delta\kappa) + i\delta\kappa(\bar{V} \times V) \cdot B \quad . \quad (10)$$

The second observation is that the extra term in (10) can be combined in the following way with F_P and F_B :

$$\begin{aligned} F_B + F_P + i\delta\kappa(\bar{V} \times V) \cdot B &= \frac{1}{2}[B + i\delta\kappa(\bar{V} \times V)]^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\beta(\bar{V}V - 1)^2 + \frac{1}{2}(\sigma - \delta\kappa^2)[i(\bar{V} \times V)]^2 \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Since this is positive definite as long as $|\delta\kappa| < \sqrt{\sigma}$, this freedom in the choice of $\delta\kappa$ in (10) can be used to transform (9) into

$$|\kappa_2| < \kappa_{123} + \sqrt{\sigma} \quad \text{and} \quad |\kappa_3| < \kappa_1 + \sqrt{\sigma} \quad (12)$$

Basically we have “pushed” the boundary of the stability region given by (9) along vectors $\pm(\sqrt{\sigma}, -\sqrt{\sigma})$. Within the region given by (12), $F \geq 0$, and the minimum value $F = 0$ is attained by the homogeneous state (4). Thus the homogeneous phase is stable if (12) is satisfied

We have just shown the sufficient character of (12). Equations (12) are also *necessary* conditions. This follows from the consideration of perturbations $V = V_0 + \delta V$ to the homogeneous state (4). Using rotational symmetry to set $\theta = 0$, one finds that F is unstable against perturbations of the form:

$$\delta V \propto \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ i \cos ky \end{pmatrix} ; \quad |\kappa_2| > \kappa_{123} + \sqrt{\sigma} \quad (13a)$$

$$\delta V \propto \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ i \cos kx \end{pmatrix} ; \quad |\kappa_3| > \kappa_1 + \sqrt{\sigma} \quad (13b)$$

These perturbations were considered by Zhitomirskii [4], who showed that (12) are necessary conditions for the stability of (4). The fact that these are identical with our new sufficient conditions means that eqs. (12) define exactly the domain of existence of the homogeneous phase (4).

Now let us consider what happens outside this domain. The point is that finding an instability of the homogeneous phase does not in itself prove the existence of an inhomogeneous phase. To do this, one also has to show that the free energy remains bounded below, and this cannot be established by studying its changes under small perturbations.

Notice, however, that our method provides such a proof: according to (5) F_P is bounded from below as long as $\sigma > -\beta$, therefore we may choose $|\delta\kappa| < \sqrt{\beta + \sigma}$, and conclude that inside the region defined by

$$|\kappa_2| < \kappa_{123} + \sqrt{\beta + \sigma}, \quad |\kappa_3| < \kappa_1 + \sqrt{\beta + \sigma}, \quad (14)$$

the total free energy density is bounded from below. This is obviously true irrespective of the sign of σ , and in the case where $\sigma > 0$ it proves the existence of a stable inhomogeneous phase without resorting to numerical techniques.

Note that eqs. (13a) and (13b) can be described as “longitudinal” and “transverse” modulations respectively and that for $\kappa_3 < -\kappa_1$ both perturbations are simultaneously unstable. In that region we may thus expect the occurrence of 2-D modulated solutions. This seems to be confirmed by the numerical simulations in [5].

To summarize, we have suggested a new approach to the study of lower bounds on the free energy of condensed matter systems inspired on Bogomolnyi’s ideas. Our basic observation is that integration by parts generally results in a mixing of the gradient, potential and magnetic contributions to the free energy which can be exploited to obtain sufficient (rather than necessary) conditions for stability. This gives complementary results to the standard analysis of small perturbations and we have shown here that in some cases it is enough to establish domains of existence for homogeneous and inhomogeneous phases. We illustrated the method in a model based on a two-dimensional representation of D_{6h} , for which we

obtained the following new *sufficient* conditions:

For $\sigma > 0$ the homogeneous state (4) is stable if and only if $|\kappa_2| < \kappa_{123} + \sqrt{\sigma}$, $|\kappa_3| < \kappa_1 + \sqrt{\sigma}$.

For $\sigma > -\beta$ and $|\kappa_2| < \kappa_{123} + \sqrt{\beta + \sigma}$, $|\kappa_3| < \kappa_1 + \sqrt{\beta + \sigma}$, irrespective of the sign of σ , the free energy density is bounded from below.

Two questions remain open: We don't know the exact domain of stability of the homogeneous phase (6) for $\sigma < 0$. All we can say is that, as long as eqs. (9) are satisfied, the homogeneous phase (6) is stable. But phase (6) is known to be stable beyond that domain, and the transition to the inhomogeneous state is of first order [4].

The second question concerns the global stability of the free energy beyond the region defined by eqs. (14), which are only sufficient conditions. Consideration of a single plane wave [4] imposes some constraints on the coefficients of the free energy, but little is known about general configurations. There are, however, two situations where we know that eqs. (14) are also necessary conditions for the free energy to be bounded from below:

For $\beta = 0$, conditions (12) and (14) are identical, and we can use a scaling argument. Beyond the domain defined by eqs. (14), the free energy will take a negative value f for a modulation of the form (13). A similar configuration with $V \rightarrow nV$, $\vec{A} \rightarrow n\vec{A}$, and $\vec{k} \rightarrow n\vec{k}$ will satisfy the same boundary conditions for n integer and will have a free energy $n^4 f$. Since n can be arbitrarily large, it is obvious that the free energy is unbounded from below.

Note that this argument does *not* apply for $\beta \neq 0$. But we have studied the system numerically and found that, for $\kappa_{23} \equiv \kappa_2 + \kappa_3 = 0$, the free energy becomes unbounded from below as soon as (14) is violated. However, our results for $\kappa_{23} \neq 0$ are inconclusive.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank G. Volovik and M. Zhitomirskii for their help locating references, M.A. Valle, M.A. Goñi, I.L. Egusquiza and P. Tiesinga for conversations; and K. Kuijken for help with numerical simulations. A.A. wishes to thank the Isaac Newton Institute and the University

of Utrecht for their hospitality. This work was partially supported by the Isaac Newton Institute (Cambridge, U.K.), by NSF grant PHY-9309364, CICYT grant AEN-93-1435 and the University of the Basque Country grant UPV-EHU 063.310-EB119/92.

REFERENCES

* Electronic address: WTPACJIA@LG.EHU.ES, ANAACHU@TH.RUG.NL

** Electronic address: WMPMAPAJ@LG.EHU.ES

[1] M. Sigrist and K. Ueda, Rev. Mod. Phys. **63** (1991) 239

[2] M.E. Zhitomirskii, JETP Lett. **49** (1989) 379

[3] M. Palumbo, P. Muzikar and J.A. Sauls, Phys. Rev. **B42** (1990) 2681

[4] M.E. Zhitomirskii, JETP Lett. **55** (1992) 472

[5] M Palumbo and P. Muzikar, Phys. Rev. **B45** (1992) 12620

[6] E.B. Bogomolnyi, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys **24** (1976) 449